



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/977,826 | 10/15/2001 | George Goicoechea | BSI-010US4 | 4645 |

7590 01/26/2004
Ratner & Prestia
One Westlakes, Berwyn, Suite 301
P.O. Box 980
Valley Forge, PA 19482

EXAMINER

MATTHEWS, WILLIAM H

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|
|----------|--------------|

3738

DATE MAILED: 01/26/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/977,826

Applicant(s)

GOICOECHEA ET AL.

Examiner

William H. Matthews (Howie)

Art Unit

3738

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 November 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 20,22-41,43-49 and 54-62 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 26,34-38,40 and 58-62 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 20,22-25,27-33,39,41,43-49 and 54-57 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 11-18-03 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
2. Applicant contends Cragg fails to disclose hoops oriented in a plane substantially perpendicular to the longitudinal axis of the stent. Examiner disagrees because the hoops are substantially perpendicular, i.e. greater than 50% perpendicular to the longitudinal axis. Merriam Webster's Collegiate Dictionary 10th Ed. defines substantial as "being largely but not wholly that which is specified".
3. Applicant contends Fontaine fails to disclose hoops oriented in a plane substantially perpendicular to the longitudinal axis of the stent and vertices of each hoop lie in a common plane perpendicular to the longitudinal axis of the stent. Examiner disagrees because the hoops are substantially perpendicular, i.e. greater than 50% perpendicular to the longitudinal axis. Merriam Webster's Collegiate Dictionary 10th Ed. defines substantial as "being largely but not wholly that which is specified". Furthermore, figures 13-16 of Fontaine clearly show embodiments in which the vertices align in a common plane perpendicular to the longitudinal axis of the stent.
4. Applicant contends Wolff fails to disclose means for securing an apex of one hoop to a juxtaposed apex of a neighboring hoop. Examiner disagrees because element 14 connects juxtaposed apices of neighboring hoops.

Double Patenting

1. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

2. Claims 20,22-25,27-33,39,41,54,55 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-6,8-14,20,23 of U.S. Patent No. 5,800,508. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because each set of claims defines structurally equivalent stents.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Art Unit: 3738

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 20,22-24,31-33,41,54,55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Cragg US PN 5,405,377.

Cragg discloses in figures 1-4 and line 40 of col. 2 through line 4 of col. 3 a stent 10 comprising a plurality of hoops 11 formed from a continuous Nitinol wire comprising pairs of elongate elements forming apices abutting apices of adjacent hoops, which are connected by thermoplastic suture material 12. All hoops are axially aligned and of equal diameter.

5. Claims 20,22-24,31,54-57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Fontaine US PN 5,370,683.

Fontaine discloses in figures 6, 9, 10, and 14 a stent comprised of a continuous wire formed into a plurality of interconnected (by welding lines 11-13 of col. 6) hoops at abutting apices or vertices (5,5' and 7,7') formed by pairs of elongate elements within each hoop. All hoops are axially aligned and of equal diameter. Lines 42-56 of col. 4 describe the vertices pointing in an axial direction and lying in a common plane perpendicular to the longitudinal axis of the stent.

Art Unit: 3738

6. Claims 20,22-25,39,43,44,47,54-55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Wolff US PN 5,104,404.

Wolff discloses in figures 1 and 6 a stent comprised of a plurality of hoops 12 interconnected at apices formed by pairs of elongate elements within each hoop. Securing means 14 connects the apices of adjacent hoops. All hoops are axially aligned and of equal or different diameter (figure 6). Figure 1 shows the longitudinal ends of the stent being square to the long axis of the stent. As shown in Figure 1, each end portion of the stent, left 12 or right 12, may have a tubular coating of radiopaque material over element 14 (see lines 63-65 of col. 3).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 45,46,48,49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wolff US PN 5,104,404 as applied to claims 54,43,44,47 above, and further in view of Piplani et al. US PN 5,824,039.

Wolff discloses the use of radiopaque markers in the form of tubes but does not expressly disclose the use of gold or platinum as the material or that the marker may be a wire. Piplani teaches a stented vascular graft having gold and platinum markers as

well as markers in the form of wires (see lines 22-26 of col. 5 and lines 14-17 of col. 7) in order to provide visibility under fluoroscopy during implantation of the device.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified the stent disclosed by Wolff to include gold or platinum as the material or to provide the marker in the form of a wire as taught by Piplani et al. in order to provide sufficient visibility under fluoroscopy during implantation of the device.

Conclusion

9. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to William H. Matthews (Howie) whose telephone number

Art Unit: 3738

is 703-305-0316. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 7:00-4:30 (Every other Friday off).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Corrine M. McDermott can be reached on 703-308-2111. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 308-2708 for regular communications and (703) 305-3590 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0858.



WHM

January 20, 2004



CORRINE McDERMOTT
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700